



September Emergency Minutes

Thursday, September 15, 2016; 7:00 p.m.

The third emergency meeting for the year 2016 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, August 16, 2016 in the Columbia/Ellicott City Room located 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. Mr. Tennor moved to approve the August 4, 2016 minutes. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; and Erica Zoren, Bruno Reich

Staff present: Samantha Holmes, Beth Burgess, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Yvette Zhou

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 16-68 – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 16-69 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 16-70 – 8247-8249 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 16-71 – 8054 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 16-72 – 8104 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 16-73 – 8049 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 16-74 – 8024-8026 Main Street, Ellicott City

REGULAR AGENDA

16-68 – 8098 Main Street, Ellicott City

Replace two side doors. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Jackie Everett

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to replace two side doors located along the alley on the side of the building. The doors were destroyed and washed away during the July 30 flood. The Applicant proposes to replace the doors in-kind with a flush birch particle core door and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The door will not have any panels or lites, which will match the previously existing doors. The doors are not visible from the public



Figure 1 - Side doors are located down the alley on the right of the building

way. The previously existing doors were not historic. Staff recommended the Applicant also consider a fiberglass door as the doors are not visible from the public way and the previously existing doors and proposed doors were not historic or of a historic style.

Staff Comments: The replacement of the missing and damaged doors with a wood door to match the previously existing door is considered Routine Maintenance, per Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines, “replacing entrance features with materials that exactly match the existing materials.” However, Staff also finds replacing these non-visible doors with a fiberglass or composite door also complies with Chapter 6.G recommendations, “many historic buildings have secondary entrances not visible from streets or other properties. Where these entrances already have a modern replacement door, a new door does not necessarily need to be of a historically appropriate style.” The previously existing doors were already replacement doors and the particle core door is not a historic style, therefore a composite or fiberglass door may be an improvement to these non-visible entrances.

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and with the option to use a fiberglass or composite door. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Jackie Everett. Ms. Everett said that she would like to use a steel door for the replacement of the side doors. She explained that they are currently a solid core composite door and swell under humidity. She said the door closest to the street is a standard size at 36x80, but the second door is 30x78 and will need to be cut down. Ms. Everett said the steel door would be easier to cut to fit and that Wilson Lumber would be able to provide a custom size steel door within a week. The door will be custom mounted to the frame. Mr. Bruno asked if the frame is steel or wood. Ms. Everett said wood.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the application as submitted with the option to use fiberglass, composite or steel doors. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-69 –8293 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Angie Tersiguel

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. This building was damaged in the July 30 flood. The Applicant seeks approval and tax credit pre-approval to make the following repairs:

- 1) Replace broken side basement windows with glass block behind louvered vents. Water infiltrated into the basement at this point. The glass block will not be visible due to the louvered vent. The windows are circled in red below.
- 2) Replace two wood flush half doors on side of building. The doors have no paneling or lites and will be replaced in-kind to match the previously existing. The doors will be white. The door openings are circled in green below.



Figure 2 - Side of Tersiguel's

Staff Comments: The basement windows were damaged during the flood and water infiltrated into the building from these openings. The Applicant proposes to replace the glass in the windows with glass block instead of normal sheet glass, in order to have a stronger barrier against possible future floods. Chapter 6.H of the Guidelines recommends repairing and replacing windows with “features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration.” However, in this instance the windows are not visible from the public way as they are covered by white wood louvered vents. The addition of the glass block will assist in protecting the interior of the building from water infiltration, but the exterior view of the window will remain the same as the wooden vents will remain in place.



Figure 3 - Aerial of Tersiguel's

The doors will be replaced in-kind to match the previously existing doors. This is considered Routine Maintenance, per Chapter 5 of the Guidelines, “repair or replacement of...external doors...using the same materials and design.”

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter

explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Ms. Angela Tersiguel. Ms. Zoren asked Ms. Tersiguel if she had considered flood windows instead of window block. Ms. Tersiguel said the block windows were recommended by the County's Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits. Mr. Reich said certain windows at coastal locations allow the water to pass through the structure, while in Ellicott City's case the priority is preventing the water from coming in. Mr. Bennett said the block is not permanently tied in to the wall and would be weakest at the mortar joint. Ms. Zoren said that she was talking about a different kind of window that does not allow water in; the flood windows would be impact resistant. She explained that a large tree branch hitting the window would not break the glass. Mr. Taylor pointed out that Mr. Bennett and Ms. Zoren are an engineer and architect and to strongly consider their recommendations. Ms. Tennor asked if the doors are original or plywood. Ms. Tersiguel said they are plywood to temporarily secure the building. The original doors were white. Ms. Tennor said that the doors could be painted a different color to blend with the foundation if desired.

Ms. Shad asked if the louvers on the vents were for ventilation and if they are still used. Ms. Tersiguel said they are not used for ventilation.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted and allow the Applicant to use a solid glass window that is impact resistant if the Applicant chooses and allow changes to color of the doors to match the foundation color, if the Applicant chooses. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-70 – 8247-8249 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, Tax credit pre-approval, Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Pauline Jacobs

Background & Scope of Work: These properties are located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT both buildings date to 1920. These buildings sustained damage in the July 30 flood. The Applicant proposes to make the following repairs:

- 1) Repair and replace brickwork under the front first floor windows at both buildings. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funding for the work.
- 2) Replace front door at both buildings with a full lite wood door to match the existing doors that were damaged in the flood. The door will be painted an orange/red to match the existing color. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.
- 3) Repair or rebuild, if needed, the back porch at 8247 Main Street. Porch will be rebuilt the same materials as the existing, using wood painted gray. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.



Figure 4 - 8247 Main Street before flood



Figure 5 - 8249 Main Street before flood



Figure 7 - 8247 Main Street after flood



Figure 6 - 8249 Main Street after flood



Figure 8 - More current conditions than Figure 6 and 7 above



Figure 9 - Rear porch on 8247 Main Street after flood

Staff Comments: Chapter 6.C recommends, “if a masonry wall of feature must be replaced, use material as similar to the original as possible, particularly if the materials are visible from a public road or are key elements of the building’s style of character.” The brick will be visible as it is located on the front of the building. Details on the brick to be used were not provided, but Staff recommends the brick and mortar used match the existing materials.

The replacement of the full lite wood door with a new full lite wood door is considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines, “replacing entrance features with materials that exactly match the existing materials.” However, the Guidelines also recommend, “maintain and repair original doors, frames, sills, lintels.” The doors did not appear to be severely damaged in the flood and it may be possible to repair any damage that did occur. The repair of the doors would also be eligible for tax credits and the Façade Improvement Program. The door will be painted the same orange/red as the existing door, which is considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 6.N, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint.”

The repair and replacement of the rear porch on 8247 Main Street is considered Routine Maintenance, per Chapter 5 of the Guidelines, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.”

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, stabilize the front foundations and prevent the rear porch from collapsing.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and recommends the front doors be repaired if possible, otherwise replacement is acceptable. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for all work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Pauline Jacobs who stated she does not want to replace the front door if it is not necessary but there was an issue with the lock and the door does not open. Ms. Holmes asked Ms. Jacobs to provide quotes as soon as possible since the State needs to review the Façade Improvement Program application. Ms. Holmes stated the quotes needed are for the brick work, door repair or replacement, but not the porch since it was on the back of the building.

Mr. Reich asked if the brick work is on the right hand bay facing the front of the building. Ms. Jacobs said brick was missing from almost all four windows of the two buildings. Mr. Reich said there was no foundation under the bay from the photos provided and he wasn’t sure what the bricks would sit on. Ms. Burgess said Department of Public Works filled the foundation area with gravel for repair access. Mr. Reich said looking at the photo of 8247 Main Street, there are two bays on the left that are sitting on part of a concrete slab with a hole underneath but nothing underneath to support the brick. Ms. Jacobs said the hole was a coal chute. Mr. Reich said at 8249 the stone wall is flush so the brick could be placed on top of the stone. Mr. Reich said the job could be bigger once the repairs begin and more tax

credit approval may be needed. Mr. Taylor said the sidewalk will be replaced eventually but how that works with the building façade is hard to determine currently.

Ms. Holmes said the above photos were from the County photographer and should show the most recent state of the building and surroundings. Ms. Holmes asked the Commission to amend the application to include any structural work. The Commission agreed. Ms. Zoren asked Ms. Jacobs if any water proofing was done before the gravel fill in. Ms. Jacobs said the waterproofing was using contractor trash bags. Ms. Holmes said that if the foundation is exposed again, waterproofing should be done to the foundation and is eligible for tax credits. Ms. Zoren suggested waterproof surfacing products to paint on the building exterior for as low the Applicant can get to on the foundation. Ms. Holmes said at one point during reconstruction at Salon Marielle next door, the foundation wall looked black, which was a waterproofing product. Ms. Holmes suggested waterproofing from the interior as well.

Ms. Tennor asked why 8249 Main Street had a canopy that was placed on the original façade when the others did not. Ms. Jacobs said it used to be a grocery store and the vegetables were placed outside. Ms. Jacobs said if something happens to the canopy, it will not go back up. Mr. Taylor reminded Ms. Jacobs to work with Staff if there are more structural repairs so she can be informed what can be covered by tax credit.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted and the Applicant can add additional structural work required to complete the work as part of the tax credit and water proofing. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-71 – 8054 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval, Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Nicole Gasper/Mike Watson

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to replace the door and frame in-kind with a wood door and frame to match the previously existing 9 lite over 2 panels. The Applicant also proposes to replace the fixed window, which was not damaged in the flood, with a double hung wood window in order to allow ventilation.



Figure 10 - Storefront several years prior to flood

Staff Comments: The application is considered Routine Maintenance per Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines, “replacing entrance features with materials that exactly match the existing materials.” The replacement door will match the previously existing door in style and material. The image in Figure 10 is the only image Staff had of the door prior to the flood, however this is several years old and the building was more recently painted different colors.

Staff has no objection to the replacement of the fixed window with a double hung window as long as the double hung window fits the existing opening and does not require additional trim for the window to fit. This is also recommended by the Guidelines, which state, “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related detail with features that fit the original openings...” It is unknown if the

existing window was original, and it makes sense to allow for air circulation in the lower level of the building.

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Watson was not present at the meeting due to a schedule conflict. The Commission discussed what type of window would have historically been in the building, recognizing that the existing window is most likely a modern replacement. The Commission thought that a casement window would preserve the existing aesthetic and allow ventilation. The Commission took a break in the application to hear other cases while Ms. Burgess called the Applicant before the Commission made a decision as Mr. Taylor recommended the application be continued. Ms. Burgess called Mr. Watson so that the Commission could proceed with the application. Mr. Watson was open to the approval of any window that allowed ventilation. Mr. Watson would like the Commission to approve a window so he can move forward. Mr. Taylor said Mr. Watson amended his application via staff communication to request a casement window. Ms. Zoren did not participate in this case.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as amended with a single lite wood casement window to be approved by Staff. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-72 – 8104 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval, Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Holly Hoenes

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to rebuild storefront in-kind to match the previously existing. The photo to the right shows the building several years prior to the July 30 flood. The repairs include:

- 1) Replacing the two picture windows with the same size glass and wood trim.
- 2) Replace the two front doors with a 9 lite over 2 vertical panel doors instead of the 9 lite over 1 “X” panel, which the application cannot find. The 1 panel will better match the architecture of the building than the X panel.
- 3) Replace the light fixtures with a similar style brass fixture.



Figure 11 - Building facade several years before flood

- 4) Replace all hardware and address numbers to match the previously existing.
- 5) Paint the building using the existing yellow on the top half of the building, using this yellow as an accent on the storefront. The trim that is white will remain white. The dark green (shown in the more current pictures below) will be changed to a Colonial Revival Gray.

Staff Comments: The in-kind replacement of the storefront windows and trim is consistent with Chapter 6 recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing” and “replacing storefront details with materials that exactly match the existing materials.” This replacement of the doors with a 9 lite over 1 panel wood door is also consistent with Chapter 6 recommendations as it is a historically appropriate door and will better match the architecture of the building. The case file for this building shows that the existing doors are not original. The original doors were 1 lite over 2 horizontal panels and the one remaining original door was replaced in the mid-1980s. Chapter 6 states, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original. Otherwise, use a door appropriate to the period and style of the building.” The original door would most likely need to be custom ordered, so Staff has no objection to the proposed door, which is an improvement from the existing doors and a historically appropriate style. However, if the Applicant wanted to install the original doors, Staff finds they would qualify for tax credit and the Façade Improvement Program.



Figure 12 - After flood



Figure 14 - After flood

The replacement of the hardware and light fixtures to match the damaged existing fixtures and hardware is considered Routine Maintenance, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.”



Figure 13 - Photo circa 1982 shows original door on right

The proposed paint colors comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.”

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work. Staff recommends Approval and tax credit pre-approval for the option to install the 1 lite over 2 horizontal panel doors.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Holly Hoenes. Ms. Hoenes said she did not understand the tax credit and asked if installing the nine lite doors would qualify. Ms. Holmes said it would qualify and explained that Staff recommended to the Commission that Ms. Hoenes’ proposal would qualify for tax credit, but that if they wanted to use the original style of door that would also qualify for the tax credit. Ms. Hoenes asked if she could have the option to install a 9 lite over one panel door instead of the two panel door she had submitted approval for. Ms. Holmes said the one panel would match the architecture of the building better than the two vertical panels she had originally applied for. Mr. Reich asked about the color changes from green to dark gray. Ms. Hoenes said the color is not a dark gray, but is more of a bluish gray called Colonial Revival. Ms. Hoenes would like to repaint the green part of the building to the gray. Ms. Zoren asked if additional wood repair would be needed. Ms. Hoenes said the hole in the photo is a crawlspace which is not very visible since it is covered by the County’s repair.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted and add the option for the Applicant to choose nine lite over two panel door or single lite over two horizontal panel door or nine lite over single panel door. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-73 – 8049 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Mark Hemmis

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to make the following repairs:

- 1) Replace damaged 1:1 wood windows with a single pane of ¼ tempered safety glass similar to the windows on the Maryland Avenue side of this building. The existing window frames have been repaired, caulked in and primed.
- 2) Repair the existing front door frame. Maintain all exterior trim surrounding the front door.
- 3) Replace the existing, damaged wood door with a full lite wood door.

Staff Comments: This storefront has been significantly altered and rebuilt after damage from the flooding from Tropical Storm Agnes and the windows and doors are not original. Chapter 6.K recommends, “when planning storefront repairs or alterations, unify the upper and lower levels in the new design.” By making these windows fixed glass instead of double hung, the Main Street façade will match the Maryland Avenue façade. A photo below shows the building prior to the damage caused by Agnes in 1972. The Maryland Avenue side of the building is still very similar to the original. The proposed window alteration now will be more similar to the historic building, which appeared to have storefront windows along Main Street and not double hung windows.



Figure 18 - After flood



Figure 17 - Current window openings framed out



Figure 15 - 2011 Google Street view



Figure 16 - Historic photo showing building before 1972

The Applicant also proposes to replace the paneled wood door with a full lite wood door. As seen in the historic photo above, this building had a full lite door. The proposed full lite replacement is more historically appropriate than the existing, which is recommended in the Guidelines. The Guidelines state, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original.”

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Ms. Shad swore in Mark Hemmis. Mr. Hemmis explained that the front door may look intact but it is inoperable but they had to cut it to get it open because it was so swollen. Mr. Hemmis said the frame will remain in place, but the plinth blocks will be replaced to match the existing. Mr. Hemmis would like to install a $\frac{3}{4}$ lite door with a kick plate at the bottom. Mr. Hemmis said he was hoping to get some options, but does not want a solid wood door. He would like anything from $\frac{1}{2}$ lite over 1 panel, $\frac{3}{4}$ lite, to full lite with a kick plate as an option, but without divided lites in the door. He said the most likely option is a $\frac{3}{4}$ lite door with a kickplate. Ms. Holmes stated that Staff finds any of the proposed options are more historically appropriate than the existing door. The Commission discussed the historic photos showing the 1972 repairs changing the façade of the building.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted and added the option for Applicant to choose a wood door that is $\frac{1}{2}$ lite, $\frac{3}{4}$ lite or full lite. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

16-74 – 8024-8026 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Kelly McMillan

Background & Scope of Work: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant proposes to make the following repairs:

- 1) Repair wood on storefront and paint to match existing colors.
- 2) Replace broken glass on storefront window with safety glass.
- 3) Repair front door and repaint with colors to match existing.
- 4) Replace broken glass on door with safety glass.
- 5) Coal chute will be secured to the brick wall.

Staff Comments: Staff has discussed this application with the Applicant and would like to also present the option to replace the door if it is beyond repair, using either the same or a similar style wood door. The photo below shows the secondary door on the neighboring building, which is a more historically appropriate style than the existing exterior doors. Also, the application states that the coal chute will be secured to the brick wall, but Staff would also like to include the option to seal and waterproof the chute so that water does not enter the basement. The existing storefront is not original.



Figure 19 - After flood

The repairs are otherwise considered Routine Maintenance, per Chapter 5, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design” and “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color.”

This application is considered an emergency as the building sustained flooding and damage during the July 30th flood. The repairs will allow the Applicant to have a secured building in order to start repairs, control mold remediation and protect against future water infiltration.



Figure 21 - After flood – Subject property is the left storefront window



Figure 20 - Existing door

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and for the alternative options recommended by Staff for replacement of the front door if needed and sealing/waterproofing of the coal chute, and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete and availability of funds. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Kelly McMillan. Ms. Burgess suggested contacting Benjamin Moore because they offered to supply more paint to help Ellicott City. Ms. McMillan responded she contacted Benjamin Moore, the owner of the Columbia store, who will meet Ms. McMillan to make sure the color is correct. Ms. Burgess and Ms. Holmes thought the building was painted in the color Prussian Blue. Ms. Tennor asked if there is a suggestion to vent the air conditioner. Ms. Holmes said Ms. McMillan is only replacing the three broken glass pane in the window not the entire window. Ms. McMillan said there is no outdoor access except the back. The Commission discussed how the air conditioning could be relocated. Ms. Holmes said the removal of the air conditioner would qualify for Façade Improvement program and tax credit for the window glass replacement. Ms. McMillan asked if the window repair work can start. Ms. Holmes said the State still needs to review the application for the Façade Improvement Program and the County still needs quotes from Ms. McMillan to proceed.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted and to allow staff to approve the actual product that replaces the door. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Allan Shad moved to adjourn. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 8:20pm.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Allan Shad, Chair

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner

Yvette Zhou, Recording Secretary